

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-18 are pending in the application, with 1 and 10 being the independent claims. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-11, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,618,735 to Krishnaswami *et al.* (hereinafter Krishnaswami"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

The claimed invention provides a system and method for maintaining the integrity of a file *at a remote location* over a communication medium, such as the Internet. The claimed invention detects, and then self-repairs, modified or corrupt files by first performing an integrity check on a file and then reinstalling the file at the remote location if the integrity check fails.

Krishnaswami appears to describe a file protection system to protect shared system files from unauthorized changes (col. 1, lines 12-13 and col. 5, lines 10-28). In particular, the disclosed file protection system "is directed to an effective way to protect shared operating system files, such as DLL files, from being inadvertently overwritten by invalid versions or otherwise incorrectly modified." Col. 4, lines 26-29. In this regard, the file protection system makes a copy of an original file in a temporary directory in the event that there is a request to modify a protected system file (col. 5 lines 29-42). In the case that the original file is overwritten with a new file, the disclosed system replaces it with the copy of the original file save in the temporary directory (col. 5, lines 56-59).

The operations discussed above all appear to be local to the computer shown in Figures 1 and 2 and not performed at a remote location via a communication medium. There is no suggestion to perform these functions over a communication medium, such as the Internet (claims 6 and 14), a local network (claims 7 and 15) or a wireless network (claims 8 and 16)

Accordingly, Krishnaswami *et al.* do not disclose "reinstalling a file" that failed an integrity check "at the remote location via a communication medium," as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Consequently, Krishnaswami does not anticipate claims 1 and 10 since it does not disclose every recited element of claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 3, 6-7 and 9, which depend from claim 1, and dependent claims 11, 14, 15 and 18, which depend from independent claim 10, are also not anticipated by Krishnaswami in view of the above and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 2, 3, 6-7, 9, 11, 14, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is also traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswami as applied to claims 1 and 10 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,659 to Logan ("Logan"). The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswami as applied to claims 1 and 10 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,760 to Gauvin *et al.* ("Gauvin"). The Examiner has

also rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswami as applied to claims 1 and 10 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,429 to Satyanarayana et al. ("Satyanarayana"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As described above, Krishnaswami et al. do not teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 10. Furthermore, Logan, Gauvin, and/or Satyanarayana do not appear to supply the missing teachings. Since the applied art of record, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 10, the combination of applied art fails to support a prima facie case of obviousness rejection of claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13 and 16 for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 10 from which they depend, respectively, and further in view of their own features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 4, 5, 8, 12, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: December 29, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600